

1                                   **VIRGINIA TOBACCO INDEMNIFICATION**  
2                                   **AND COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION COMMISSION**

3                                   701 East Franklin Street, Suite 501

4                                   Richmond, Virginia 23219

5  
6  
7  
8  
9                                   **Long Range Plan Committee Meeting**

10                                  Tuesday, July 8, 2008

11                                  11:00 a.m.

12  
13                                  Conference Room 3

14                                  Patrick Henry Building

15                                  Richmond, Virginia

1    **APPEARANCES:**

2    The Honorable Kathy J. Byron, Committee Chairman  
3    The Honorable Jody Wagner, Secretary of Finance  
4    The Honorable William C. Wampler, Jr.  
5    The Honorable Thomas C. Wright, Jr.  
6    The Honorable Frank M. Ruff  
7    The Honorable Patrick Gottschalk, Secretary of Commerce & Trade  
8    The Honorable Danny Marshall  
9    Mr. L. Jackson Hite  
10   Ms. Connie Lee Greene Nyholm  
11   Mr. Kenneth Reynolds

12

13   **COMMISSION STAFF:**

14   Mr. Neal Noyes, Executive Director  
15   Mr. Ned Stephenson, Deputy Director  
16   Mr. Timothy S. Pfohl, Grants Program Administration Manager  
17   Ms. Britt Nelson, Grants Coordinator - Southside Virginia  
18   Ms. Stephanie Wass, Director of Finance

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 DELEGATE BYRON: I'm going to call the  
2 meeting to order. Good morning, everyone. I'll ask Neal to call the roll.  
3 MR. NOYES: Mr. Banner?  
4 MR. BANNER: (No response.)  
5 MR. NOYES: Delegate Byron?  
6 DELEGATE BYRON: Here.  
7 MR. NOYES: Secretary Gottschalk?  
8 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: Here.  
9 MR. NOYES: Mr. Hite?  
10 MR. HITE: Here.  
11 MR. NOYES: Delegate Marshall?  
12 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Here.  
13 MR. NOYES: Ms. Nyholm?  
14 MS. NYHOLM: Here.  
15 MR. NOYES: Senator Puckett?  
16 SENATOR PUCKETT: (No response.)  
17 MR. NOYES: Senator Reynolds?  
18 SENATOR REYNOLDS: (No response.)  
19 MR. NOYES: Senator Ruff?  
20 SENATOR RUFF: Here.  
21 MR. NOYES: Secretary Wagner?  
22 SECRETARY WAGNER: Here.  
23 MR. NOYES: Senator Wampler?  
24 SENATOR WAMPLER: Here.  
25 MR. NOYES: Delegate Wright?

1 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Here.

2 MR. NOYES: You have a quorum.

3 DELEGATE BYRON: We'll wait and do the  
4 meeting Minutes next time. I think we're going to go over a quick recap of  
5 the last meeting. Some of you were not able to attend that meeting, and  
6 some people had to leave the meeting early. So, we'll get a brief recap of  
7 those things that we have already discussed.

8 Ned, please.

9 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman, I'm  
10 going to make this very quick and just recap what you did at your June 10th  
11 meeting. If you want me to pause, anybody, you'll have to speak up and ask  
12 me to stop, and then I'll call the point at which we left off in Danville, and  
13 then we can begin to resume that work.

14 Very quickly, the Blue Ribbon Panel made recommendations to  
15 you. We presented them last time in priority order according to a little  
16 survey that you participated in. Your Staff listed some pros and cons for  
17 each one. After some discussion, you decided what you wanted to do. I'll  
18 give you a heads up; when you see red ink on the screen, that designates a  
19 recommendation that will require a Code change if you choose to adopt it.  
20 Anything you see in blue ink represents what the Committee did last time,  
21 and I'll recap that in a moment.

22 At the last meeting the Chairman asked for each  
23 recommendation that you either adopt it, table it or pass by it, and that  
24 seemed to have worked well. So I guess we will continue in that same  
25 format. Last time you heard ten of the Blue Ribbon recommendations, you

1 adopted five of them, tabled three and passed by two of them. This is the  
2 format that you were used to looking at last time with the pros and cons.

3 Real quickly, here is what you did last time. There was a  
4 recommendation that you set rules to avoid duplication. You elected to pass  
5 by that with an admonition to the Staff to point out duplications as they  
6 occur. There was a recommendation for more money to be budgeted for  
7 Education, and you tabled that until another day. There was a  
8 recommendation to add measurable outcomes to the plan. You tabled that,  
9 on the advice of the Executive Director that we had already done that and we  
10 just needed a little time to work on that. There was a recommendation that  
11 indemnification payments be accelerated. That also was tabled. There was a  
12 recommendation that you require as a matter of policy a cash match from  
13 grantees, and that was adopted with an amendment that you made to that  
14 particular language, and you can see that in your packet that is being  
15 distributed in a minute. There was a recommendation that you reduce the  
16 number of committees and align them with your Strategic Plan, and that was  
17 adopted as presented. There was one recommendation that you adopt an  
18 investor approach using RFPs instead of just grant awards, and that was  
19 adopted on a where-possible basis. There was a recommendation that you  
20 eliminate the formulas that are used in Southside Virginia. You chose to  
21 pass by that one. There was another one that you adopt a corporate  
22 governance model for the administration of Commission affairs. That was  
23 also adopted. There was a recommendation that you seek a performance  
24 review from a group like JLARC or others, and that was also adopted.

25 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Pardon me, I attended the

1 meeting and had to leave early last time, and I didn't get the opportunity to  
2 vote on this particular item, and subsequently I was asked how I felt about  
3 the item, and I told the reporter that I wasn't able to vote on it at the meeting  
4 because I had to leave because of family business, and how I felt about it. I  
5 would like to have an opportunity to vote on that if someone would show me  
6 the courtesy of calling the item back up again for consideration.

7 DELEGATE BYRON: Ned, do we have more  
8 there?

9 MR. STEPHENSON: We're about at the half-way  
10 mark where we left off last time. We have about 12 more items to go.

11 DELEGATE BYRON: We're at the end of where  
12 our work finished?

13 MR. STEPHENSON: Yes, that is the last one, yes,  
14 ma'am.

15 DELEGATE WRIGHT: We can do it now or wait  
16 until the end.

17 SENATOR WAMPLER: Madam Chairman, I'll  
18 move to reconsider it, but I was not on the prevailing side. I wasn't there, so  
19 I couldn't make the motion.

20 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So the proper motion  
21 would be, having voted on the prevailing side when we did this, but I was  
22 not there and I didn't vote, so I can't make the motion.

23 SENATOR RUFF: Point of order; at that point did  
24 we have a quorum?

25 MR. STEPHENSON: Neal, wasn't the vote four to

1 three and seven persons were present and voting, thirteen members, and  
2 seven is a quorum?

3 MR. NOYES: We did.

4 DELEGATE BYRON: We did have a quorum,  
5 seven members. The four that voted for it, can we repeat that again?

6 MR. NOYES: Secretary Gottschalk, Secretary  
7 Wagner, Senator Reynolds and Mr. Hite were for it.

8 DELEGATE BYRON: We need a motion from  
9 the quiet side of the room here.

10 SECRETARY WAGNER: Let me talk about this  
11 and ask you something; let's talk about it first. Our concern is, and it's very  
12 logical at some point we need to know what we've done with these  
13 investments and how well they have been handled as far as transforming the  
14 region, that really was it. This request is, or recommendation by the Blue  
15 Ribbon Panel, to get JLARC or some other group to take a look at the  
16 outcomes. It's hard to make an argument why that isn't good government.  
17 So, while I don't want to say we can't reconsider it, but I certainly want you  
18 to understand why we think it is, and I 'm speaking for myself, but I think it  
19 makes sense that good government examines what we have done to see that  
20 it's working and look for ways to improve.

21 SENATOR RUFF: I would agree with what you  
22 say a hundred percent, but the only issue we have is how it's measured, but  
23 the reality is that the motion already began with the assignment of Britt to  
24 begin that review of what we're doing. I don't think, until she has a chance  
25 to review things, that we accomplish a whole lot by having an outsider do

1 the same thing that we're asking her to do. It seems to me the proper thing to  
2 do would be to allow her to establish some kind of criteria, some kind of  
3 level that we receive, where we've gone, where we're going, where we've  
4 done good or bad, and then have someone come, or some outside  
5 organization come in and do it.

6 SECRETARY WAGNER: I understand your  
7 logic, but I guess my concern is not just that we're doing it on an existing  
8 project, but are we measuring goals and objectives and are we looking at the  
9 big picture of what we're doing and whether or not it is actually achieving  
10 the transformation that we're hoping to do and what we expect one billion  
11 dollars to be able to do.

12 DELEGATE MARSHALL: If you look at this,  
13 you can ask JLARC or other appropriate entities to conduct a formal  
14 evaluation. As Senator Ruff just said, we wouldn't have JLARC, but we  
15 have another appropriate entity that is going to do that.

16 SECRETARY WAGNER: I think your comment,  
17 when you do it versus an outside organization, that can be very different.  
18 When you have an employee in the organization, that places them in a much  
19 more difficult position to be completely objective.

20 SENATOR WAMPLER: I don't know if you'll let  
21 us discuss the issue without a motion before us, but it appears we're already  
22 there, so I'll offer my comments. First of all, I would hope that the  
23 Commission would always entertain a request from any commissioner to  
24 have any matter brought before us, and whether we vote on it or not, I hope  
25 the courtesy would be extended to where we could do that on this matter or



1 any other matter. I think that's the proper way to go about it and try to  
2 generate discussion and hopefully consensus. I understand both Secretaries'  
3 views on this one if the Kaine administration feels very strongly that JLARC  
4 ought to examine. For those members sitting at this table who were not  
5 present at the last meeting, I asked Secretary Wagner, along with Delegate  
6 Marshall, why don't we have someone within the first secretariat perform the  
7 same examination. I further requested that it's the Legislature ultimately  
8 who asks JLARC to initiate any type of examination of any subject matter in  
9 whatever depth. Even if the Kaine administration says they want JLARC to  
10 perform whatever scope it is, it's ultimately up to the Legislature to make  
11 that determination. I offered in good faith what I thought that Secretary  
12 Wagner wanted, have somebody from DPD take a shot at what we're doing,  
13 and they can do it without having to wait until July of '09 to accomplish that.  
14 Obviously, that didn't carry the majority of the votes.

15 As far as Delegate Wright's point, I think it is a courtesy to  
16 allow his views to be heard, and I appreciate the Chair letting those people  
17 speak who want to. I hope this isn't one we fall out over, but it just seems  
18 like there are plenty of people who would be able to do what we want to do.

19 DELEGATE BYRON: We are reviewing a  
20 Commission that spent a considerable amount of time looking over the  
21 Tobacco Commission. I'd also have to say are there certain concerns that the  
22 administration feels are not being addressed that by themselves or by the  
23 administration that is leading you to go in this direction?

24 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: First of all, I  
25 want to make it clear that I would agree with everything that Secretary

1 Wagner said before. I guess the real rub here is why wouldn't you want  
2 somebody who is competent in these matters to take a look at where we have  
3 invested money during the last ten years? I just keep coming back, and it's a  
4 little bit of a circular thought process in my head, I keep coming back, and of  
5 course, you should, that is a good suggestion by the Blue Ribbon Panel as an  
6 outside group with distinguished Virginians who have looked at this and  
7 have said we think this would be helpful. I keep coming back, and I must  
8 say I agree. That's kind of my position.

9 MS. NYHOLM: Earlier in the discussion, number  
10 15, which I guess was the third one that's been tabled, which was to evaluate  
11 ourselves based on measurable outcomes and goals. That had been tabled  
12 earlier in the discussion and maybe before we had some discussion on the  
13 Blue Ribbon Panel. I have to just wonder how JLARC, which I'm not  
14 familiar with and I admit, how would they evaluate what is transformative if  
15 we haven't established hard choices of measurable outcomes and goals and  
16 we are not determining them or more finite measurable ways, as Britt is  
17 going to be doing, and then work with the Staff members to evaluate  
18 ourselves and then go to some outside agency. I think we're capable of  
19 evaluating what we do as far as the measurable outcomes and goals, and  
20 then, as I said, an outside agency can look at what's transformative and what  
21 is not.

22 SECRETARY WAGNER: I guess one of the  
23 things that I'm, JLARC is a creature of the General Assembly. JLARC has  
24 done a lot of different things. They have a strong staff of people who are  
25 analytical, and they come up with a lot of very impressive recommendations

1 and thoughts, and that's the reason I was. DPD is more of a budget process.  
2 I thought they could be of value. That's why I thought that would be  
3 appropriate. It wasn't that I thought that the Commission had done anything  
4 wrong. I think JLARC would be of added value. There's a billion dollars  
5 worth of state money involved here, and I feel compelled to try to make sure  
6 that we're maximizing the investments the best way we can.

7 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Am I to assume that, by  
8 the extensive debate we've had on this issue, that my vote would be  
9 influenced with regard to the motion to reconsider? Otherwise it's a waste  
10 of time.

11 DELEGATE BYRON: I want you to be able to  
12 express your opinions and make comments and then move on if we're not  
13 going to deal with it then or now.

14 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I take it my request is not  
15 being accepted?

16 DELEGATE BYRON: As of this time.

17 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Let me say this for the  
18 record. I am opposed to this item, and had I been able to be here I would  
19 have voted against it. I'm somewhat disappointed at the direction that this  
20 appears to be taking.

21 DELEGATE BYRON: Secretary Gottschalk.

22 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: In the spirit of  
23 comity and good government I would like to offer a motion to request that.  
24 We have already had the discussion at length and then the vote. Having  
25 voted on the positive side last time, I think I can do that.

1 DELEGATE BYRON: You may.

2 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I'd make the  
3 motion, and I can't remember what it was.

4 DELEGATE BYRON: It was the prevailing side  
5 by which we adopted number 14, seek performance review by JLARC.

6 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: Motion to  
7 reconsider number 14, seeking a performance review, with JLARC  
8 conducting it.

9 SECRETARY WAGNER: Second.

10 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a motion and a  
11 second to reconsider the vote by which we adopted number 14. All those in  
12 favor say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.) Number 14 is back  
13 before us for discussion.

14 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Thank you.

15 SENATOR RUFF: Madam Chairman, I think it's a  
16 good idea, but I think it's a problem of time, and I'm wondering if those  
17 supporting that would be willing to accept a later date than '09 or '10 and  
18 maybe '11 to make the changes you're making in the structure of it and then  
19 have someone.

20 SECRETARY WAGNER: My understanding of  
21 JLARC's schedule is when you ask for them you'll probably end up like  
22 2010 or beyond. I think it makes sense to request that they come back in at a  
23 date, or something like 2010, get it scheduled so we know that it can happen,  
24 and I would be in favor of that.

25 DELEGATE BYRON: Are we going to say "or

1 appropriate entity"?

2 SENATOR WAMPLER: I appreciate the  
3 concession from the other side of the table, but I would say that for those  
4 who will be sitting in the committees trying to ask JLARC to study this,  
5 there is no guarantee 2010, '11 or '12 the workload will be such that this will  
6 be of import where it would take precedence over other issues. It is  
7 important, as Senator Ruff said, to have another entity, whether the  
8 Executive Branch looks at it and performs it, I don't know. I care about what  
9 I vote on, and I want to make sure we don't dishonor a commitment that may  
10 be there.

11 SECRETARY WAGNER: I move that we request  
12 JLARC or another appropriate entity to evaluate the performance or do a  
13 performance review of the investments the Tobacco Commission has done  
14 some time in fiscal year 2010.

15 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: Second.

16 SENATOR RUFF: Neal, considering what Britt  
17 has to do, do you believe that will allow sufficient in-house review in that  
18 time frame?

19 MR. NOYES: I do, Senator. We're talking a year  
20 out from about now, and I think Britt will have made significant progress in  
21 doing this review and really take a look at the performance of the  
22 investments we have made to date.

23 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, I  
24 agree with Senator Wampler. I think the appropriate entity would be all  
25 right, but JLARC, I just don't agree at this time. I think we need to make

1 sure we've had a proper evaluation and put that in place ourselves. I think  
2 we can get ahead of ourselves a little bit.

3 DELEGATE BYRON: Does the Committee want  
4 to pass this by, or do you want to vote on it up or down right now? You  
5 heard the motion; the motion has been made and seconded.

6 SECRETARY WAGNER: I move that we request  
7 a performance review of our investment criteria outcome by JLARC, or  
8 another appropriate entity if JLARC cannot do it, some time in 2010.

9 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: Second.

10 DELEGATE BYRON: Hearing no further  
11 discussion, all in favor say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No.)

12 DELEGATE BYRON: We have seven yeses and  
13 three nos.

14 All right, let's move on to the next one.

15 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman, that  
16 concludes the items that you looked at last time, and these now before you  
17 are the remaining 12 recommendations. I'll remind the Committee that you  
18 are seeing these in the priority order in which you chose, which kind of  
19 means that some of these today were of lesser priority, in your view, than the  
20 earlier ones. I will not try to read these, and I'll just offer any comments that  
21 you wish from the Staff and have discussion at that time.

22 DELEGATE BYRON: Any discussion from the  
23 Committee on creating foundations?

24 SENATOR RUFF: Madam Chairman, I think that  
25 would be a reasonable proposal. The things we do like the Scholarship

1 Program, I don't know that it makes a whole lot of difference if we take  
2 budget money year-to-year or whether we have a foundation. I think we  
3 have a commitment for the Loan Scholarship Program, and it's a working  
4 program. It maintains cash for long term; whether it's in account A or  
5 account B, it's all in the same interest. I think it's something we should look  
6 at.

7 DELEGATE BYRON: I think it's pretty good, and  
8 unless I hear from other members of the Committee or hear opposition  
9 --

10 SENATOR RUFF: -- I'd move we accept it.

11 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a motion and a  
12 second to accept number four, the recommendation that creates foundations.  
13 All in favor say aye?

14 SENATOR WAMPLER: I would just like to say  
15 that I would encourage Staff to speak with the bond counsel and make sure  
16 that we remain in accordance with any covenants that may be active. I also  
17 hope that we use this as matching dollars and that the foundation all of a  
18 sudden not be a primary source of funding that would otherwise have state  
19 dollars, for example. I realize that's much more detail than we need at this  
20 meeting, but I would hope that the Staff would continue with their work to  
21 do so.

22 DELEGATE BYRON: Any further comments?

23 All in favor say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

24 Number five.

25 MR. STEPHENSON: There was a

1 recommendation that the Commission adopt a biennial review of its own  
2 Long-Range Plan.

3 DELEGATE MARSHALL: So moved.

4 DELEGATE BYRON: It's been moved and  
5 seconded. All in favor say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

6 MR. STEPHENSON: There was a  
7 recommendation that the Commission seek to reduce the number of  
8 members on the Commission, and if you'll note the red ink, I believe that  
9 would require a Code change.

10 DELEGATE BYRON: Are you referring to the  
11 administration?

12 MR. STEPHENSON: Maybe I've got that out of  
13 order. The Blue Ribbon Report suggested that a 31-member oversight body  
14 was unusually large, and I think the language that they chose to use in that  
15 recommendation was a reduction of the membership, quote, "without regard  
16 to classification". Meaning that they were not targeting any single group of  
17 commissioners or Commission members, but simply the fact that there are so  
18 many.

19 DELEGATE BYRON: I think that when we first  
20 went through the process of the legislation to come up with the Commission,  
21 a lot of effort went into a balance. Even though it may seem large, or it may  
22 seem large, but what they're doing with the funds that have been placed in  
23 their care and with the tremendous balance and citizen input along with the  
24 Legislative and Administrative oversight, I don't see how you could get any  
25 kind of agreement to begin to reduce the makeup of that without stepping on



1 some toes, unless the Administration feels that they don't need as many.

2 SENATOR RUFF: Madam Chairman, I think it  
3 raises a couple of issues. One of those is that the growing communities  
4 believe that this appears to be an effort to get rid of them, and I don't think  
5 that serves the Commission well. The second thing is I'm not sure how  
6 much legislation went through the General Assembly. Any time we go to  
7 the General Assembly we risk putting everything on the table and what it  
8 accomplishes. It would be nicer to have a more workable smaller group, but  
9 I don't think the risk outweighs, it certainly outweighs what I believe to be  
10 gained from that.

11 MR. REYNOLDS: Madam Chairman, certainly  
12 from my observation, and I'm a new member, and since I've been a member  
13 of this Commission, we are fairly well balanced. There are a lot of different  
14 interest groups represented, and I think the Commission is structured  
15 reasonably fair. I would think reducing the Commission is not a good idea.

16 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Madam Chairman, I'd  
17 make a motion to table this.

18 DELEGATE BYRON: There is a motion to table  
19 number six.

20 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: My question is,  
21 when we table this are we asking the Staff to go back and review it and then  
22 automatically come back to another vote?

23 DELEGATE BYRON: Ned, would you clarify  
24 this again, if you would?

25 MR. STEPHENSON: The model that you used

1 last time was one of three outcomes. It was adopted, or it was tabled, which  
2 meant you would take it up again at a later time, or you would pass it by,  
3 meaning that it failed and would not come back again.

4 DELEGATE MARSHALL: My motion is to pass  
5 it by, and I'll withdraw my other motion.

6 SENATOR RUFF: Then I'll withdraw my second  
7 on that.

8 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a motion to pass  
9 it by.

10 SENATOR RUFF: I'll second it.

11 DELEGATE BYRON: And duly seconded. Any  
12 more discussion on that?

13 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I think any  
14 organization of this type being created new is better served by a smaller  
15 board. A number of them that I'm familiar with, maybe 15 or so, and I'm  
16 speaking from my background as a corporate lawyer, and many very large  
17 companies are run by a board of anywhere from 12 to 13 to 15 people. My  
18 instinct is about 15. I just wanted to throw that out. I see where the board is  
19 going, and I understand the reason for it, because it's just more manageable.  
20 I take Senator Ruff's point very much to heart. I'm not referring to anyone  
21 else's representation or any institution, including the Secretary of Commerce  
22 and Secretary of Finance and Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor's  
23 representatives on the board to be feeling like they're expelled or reduced or  
24 their vote doesn't count. I just wanted to give you those thoughts. I would  
25 have to vote against the recommendation to pass it by, and I just wanted to

1 make sure that you understood why I felt that way.

2 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a lot of expertise  
3 on the Commission, and we take a lot of consideration with appointments  
4 made to the board, and I think when the Chairman makes the different sub-  
5 committees, that was meant for a very good reason. The Commission has  
6 always been looked at as separating Southside and Southwest. I think we all  
7 benefit, all having the same common goals, revitalizing our communities, as  
8 some of the discussions that we have been working on in front of the  
9 Commission, and that we actually benefit by bringing everyone together  
10 under one body. As Senator Ruff said, there is more fear of bringing this  
11 back in front of the General Assembly and bringing to their attention the  
12 changes they could possibly make that would not benefit Southside or  
13 Southwest.

14 Is there any more discussion? There is a motion to pass by. All  
15 in favor say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No.) There are three opposed. The  
16 motion passes.

17 MR. STEPHENSON: The next one is number 19,  
18 recommendation to create systemic business investment program, and a little  
19 explanation is in order. I think the Blue Ribbon Panel suggested that some  
20 of our programs be set up with firm policy guidelines and amounts of money  
21 such that any applicant that stepped up and met those guidelines would  
22 automatically be approved in a systemic fashion, such as modeled after the  
23 State Enterprise Zone Program, where it has certain criteria that if a  
24 company meets they qualify and they get a grant. It was suggested by the  
25 Blue Ribbon Panel that some of these programs operated in that manner.

1 SECRETARY WAGNER: I'm not in favor of this  
2 one. The economic reality or economic decisions are very, I'd be  
3 uncomfortable committing to something that wouldn't give you a chance to  
4 make case-by-case decisions.

5 SENATOR WAMPLER: I'd have to vote against  
6 this also. I would take it a step further and say that in my neck of the woods  
7 planning district commissions are who we look to for their regional approach  
8 to things. Even though we vote against it, I think there is merit, and that if  
9 there is a particular algorithm or a particular equation they think we ought to  
10 examine, I think we should explore it a little bit further, but I don't think it's  
11 ripe yet. I would be fearful that if we adopt that, then we would not be  
12 eligible for other state funding programs. I don't want to just reject it  
13 summarily, and I appreciate the Commission's work on that, and maybe it's  
14 something that can ripen a little bit.

15 DELEGATE BYRON: Any further discussion?

16 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I move we pass it by.

17 SENATOR RUFF: Second.

18 DELEGATE BYRON: Motion is made we pass it  
19 by, and it's seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor of passing by  
20 number 19 say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

21 MR. STEPHENSON: The next is number 21, a  
22 recommendation that the Commission concentrate its TROF awards on a few  
23 select industries so as to create a critical mass of that industry in a certain  
24 geographical region. It was suggested that we model this after some of the  
25 efforts that have been used and that we target certain high value clusters

1 rather than having the TROF program available to any business or industry.

2 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I would vote  
3 against this. I don't think this is a good idea. I understand the Blue Ribbon  
4 Panel's reason for it. I think there is a possibility that we would lose in the  
5 long run, this doesn't happen to be what we're trying to do. I think that  
6 would be a shame. I think the nature of Southside and Southwest is that we  
7 look at all projects, not exclusively at a particular type of project because it  
8 doesn't fit within a prescribed category. If we said we're going to do life  
9 sciences and manufacturing and wood products and everything going outside  
10 of that would not be considered, I don't think that's a good idea.

11 DELEGATE MARSHALL: I think if this  
12 discussion was held in our area probably some years ago when textile and  
13 tobacco companies came to our area and we had all of our economic eggs in  
14 furniture and textiles and tobacco this would be a great idea, but I can see the  
15 devastation that's happened by doing this. I don't think this is a good idea.

16 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I think it would be nice if  
17 we got to the point where we could actually consider this type of thing. I  
18 want to try to have something that's stable.

19 SENATOR WAMPLER: The last thing I was  
20 going to try to find ways to let the Blue Ribbon Panel know that we  
21 appreciate the thoughts and we tried to accommodate as best we could. I  
22 think they misunderstand some of the tools we have, and that is invading the  
23 corpus should we have the ability to impact critical mass for a mega  
24 industry, or whatever the case may be. I don't know if it's going to be Neal's  
25 or Ned's function to stand on the street corner and yell back our responses at

1 high noon on the first day of the month. I hope they understand that if we  
2 don't adopt their recommendations we do have the ability to accomplish  
3 rather large projects when we think it's appropriate.

4 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, I  
5 move that we pass it by.

6 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Second.

7 DELEGATE BYRON: It's been moved that we  
8 pass it by, and seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye?  
9 (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

10 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman,  
11 recommendation number nine suggested that you discuss term limits for  
12 Commission chairs, for your sub-committee chairmanship. For the benefit  
13 of this Committee, according to our By-laws, the setting of committee chairs  
14 is according to the Chairman's wishes.

15 DELEGATE BYRON: The sub-committees, or is  
16 that the full Commission?

17 MR. STEPHENSON: Sub-committee, I use the  
18 term sub-committee interchangeably. I believe the By-laws are silent as to  
19 the term limits for committee chairs.

20 SECRETARY WAGNER: I move that we adopt  
21 this modification, and the modification being a two-year term. We think it's  
22 way too short for someone to be chairing something and understand what  
23 they're doing and make a difference, and that it be a six-year term, a longer  
24 period of time you can accomplish something.

25 DELEGATE BYRON: This is another one of

1 those that certainly sounds good and has merit, but I'd like to think the  
2 Chairman is sitting here and he would like the flexibility, and that's one  
3 thing we have done, that is to have had the flexibility to change the  
4 committees as we have moved through the process, and we have added some  
5 committees now. If everything stays the same for the next six years, that  
6 may work, and it may be instrumental, and by adopting it the committee can  
7 change, and I don't know if it's a moot point or not, but well taken. If the  
8 committee structure stays the same, the Chair may feel it's not a good time.  
9 Any further discussion?

10 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I would second  
11 the motion.

12 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a motion to adopt  
13 term limits for a period of six years for the committee chair, and there's a  
14 second. Any further discussion?

15 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Does that mean one term  
16 of six years or --

17 SECRETARY WAGNER: -- You can't serve as  
18 chairman for more than six years, depending on what the By-laws say. The  
19 idea being that, not a six-year term, but the maximum you can serve as  
20 chairman is six years.

21 DELEGATE WRIGHT: So it's not really a term  
22 limit?

23 SECRETARY WAGNER: No, but it gives an  
24 opportunity for other people to serve.

25 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Six years concurrent, you

1 could serve two years, go off and then come back on for six more years?

2 SECRETARY WAGNER: Like the Governor.

3 DELEGATE BYRON: This would require a By-  
4 law change, and that would be within the structure of the Commission.

5 SECRETARY WAGNER: Yes.

6 DELEGATE BYRON: Any further discussion?

7 SENATOR WAMPLER: I vote against the term  
8 limits on anything. If somebody doesn't think the committee chair is doing  
9 the job, they can obviously take that matter up and speak with the committee  
10 chairs. Anything that I have chaired or aspired to chair, if the members don't  
11 think you're doing a good job, I think you can lose that degree of flexibility.  
12 I understand the Executive Branch on that and the term limit on the  
13 Governor for four years, and I understand where you all speak. I think it  
14 speaks of continuity on the other side; that's just a difference of opinion.

15 DELEGATE BYRON: Delegates and Senators  
16 come and go.

17 SENATOR RUFF: Currently the chairmanships  
18 are at the discretion of the Chairman of the Commission. He can move  
19 anybody he wants to. There is a mechanism if the Chairman feels a move is  
20 necessary.

21 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Does the Executive  
22 Committee vote on those chairs, or just the Chairman?

23 MR. NOYES: That is the Chairman's exclusive  
24 prerogative.

25 DELEGATE BYRON: Which is why he asked



1 that the structure be looked at. Is there any further discussion on the  
2 motion? We have a motion to adopt number 9, term limits for six years for  
3 committee chairs. All those in favor say aye? (Ayes.) No's? (No.) The  
4 motion fails, seven to three.

5 MR. NOYES: It fails seven to three. We now  
6 need a motion to pass it by.

7 DELEGATE BYRON: We need a motion to pass  
8 by number 9, and it's seconded. All those in favor say aye? (Ayes.)  
9 Opposed? (No.) The motion passes to pass it by.

10 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman,  
11 recommendation number 10 is that you adopt membership criteria for a seat  
12 on the Commission. By way of explanation, the Blue Ribbon Panel was  
13 suggesting that membership on the Commission be limited to persons of  
14 certain demonstrated proficiency in the area of economic development,  
15 education or industry before they were placed on the Commission.

16 DELEGATE MARSHALL: I assume they're  
17 talking about citizen members and not legislative members?

18 DELEGATE BYRON: I would comment, I think  
19 this is already being done by those appointees, and of course elected officials  
20 bring their own, because every two or four years by their constituents.

21 Mr. Hite.

22 MR. HITE: I don't see how we can determine the  
23 criteria for membership. I'd like somebody to try, but I believe we should  
24 pass it by.

25 DELEGATE BYRON: There's a motion to pass it

1 by, there's a second. Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye?  
2 (Ayes.) Any opposed? (No response.) All right.

3 MR. STEPHENSON: Next up is number 2, and  
4 the Blue Ribbon Panel suggested that the Commission and/or Staff conduct  
5 regular meetings with the Treasury Department concerning the status of the  
6 Endowment.

7 SECRETARY WAGNER: Because there are  
8 meetings, and there is a lot of information flowing back and forth. While I'll  
9 agree with the Blue Ribbon Panel, I would say that it is happening, so I'm  
10 not sure we have to pass, effectively, it is happening; to the extent Neal or  
11 anyone on the Commission Staff thinks there's a need for it being done more  
12 often, we're totally prepared to do so.

13 DELEGATE MARSHALL: It just says regular  
14 meetings; there is no definition of regular. How often is that happening  
15 now?

16 MR. NOYES: Monthly, it's pretty regular.

17 SENATOR WAMPLER: Maybe in an attempt to  
18 accommodate the Blue Ribbon Panel we could have Madam Secretary report  
19 to us at the Commission meetings the investment results and what we're  
20 doing to make the maximum yield on our portfolio, and I think that might  
21 accomplish the same objective; that's a friendly suggestion.

22 SECRETARY WAGNER: Very similar to what  
23 Troutman Sanders does.

24 SENATOR WAMPLER: Madam Chairman, for  
25 the record, it does not suggest they have not in the past. We would just have

1 it as a point on the agenda. So, I would think, Madam Chairman, just by  
2 having it on the agenda as an action item and to brief the Commission would  
3 have accomplished the task. I'm comfortable with Madam Secretary doing  
4 her job; we don't need to tell her what the definition of a meeting should be.

5 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Madam Chairman, what  
6 motion would be appropriate to get where we want to go?

7 SENATOR WAMPLER: I'd say pass by it.

8 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I'll second it.

9 SENATOR WAMPLER: I'll make that motion.

10 DELEGATE BYRON: So we'll pass it by. I  
11 would hope that we could do a letter to the Blue Ribbon Panel and signify  
12 the things that they have recommended, those in essence that are already  
13 being done, clarify that.

14 MR. NOYES: We can do that after the Board's  
15 retreat.

16 SECRETARY WAGNER: I think part of what  
17 they were concerned about wasn't so much Treasury, but letting Treasury let  
18 you know so you'd understand, and also that they could invest appropriately,  
19 and the Tobacco Commission has been very open with Treasury, and it  
20 really has nothing to do with how the Commission is spending their money.

21 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a motion to pass  
22 it by. All those in favor say aye? (Ayes.) Any opposed? (No response.)

23 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman, the Blue  
24 Ribbon Panel suggested that you consider adding the Secretary of Education  
25 to the Commission. Noting the red ink, that would require a Code change.

1 DELEGATE BYRON: Is this after they reviewed  
2 it and they said reduce it?

3 MR. STEPHENSON: It was in the same breath.

4 SENATOR RUFF: Madam Secretary, I think that  
5 adding the Secretary of Education possibly, I don't see, I think maybe the  
6 Secretary would be an ex-officio member without changing the Code. That  
7 would be preferable.

8 DELEGATE BYRON: If it doesn't require a Code  
9 change.

10 MR. NOYES: Certainly the Secretary of  
11 Education could be apprised of programs that we undertake. The Staff could  
12 report to the Commission what the Secretary might wish us to do, or if there  
13 was something to do differently. I would think that having somebody as an  
14 ex-officio member would require a Code change.

15 SENATOR WAMPLER: I would agree with that,  
16 I think it probably would require a Code change. I was going to ask in a  
17 friendly way, and before we take the Secretary of Education, would the  
18 Secretary of Education want to spend time on the Commission? Would it be  
19 a designee of the, the Chair can always invite anyone to participate and be  
20 part of that, but if we go through the exercise to decide whether it would be a  
21 Code change, the Secretary might send a designee. We would love to have  
22 someone.

23 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I would offer this  
24 view. It's not any particular Secretary of Education or his successor. It is a  
25 position, and whether there is any particular Secretary of Education

1 interested in attending or if they send a designee, it's important, and I  
2 understand. I think your point is well taken. I guess I would say the Blue  
3 Ribbon Panel, as I read the message, was we need to do more with our  
4 energies in transformation. They made a recommendation that we consider  
5 more money for education. This is another follow-on in that message that if  
6 education increases credentialing is important to economic development  
7 formation, then why wouldn't the Secretary of Education be part of the  
8 Board? That's the message I got. I agree with that. That whole Secretariat,  
9 K through 12 and higher ed, community colleges, would be present through  
10 the Secretary or his designee. I like the concept of the Secretary of  
11 Education being more active with the Commission.

12 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I think this could send a  
13 signal that we are about to make a significant change in policy of the  
14 Tobacco Commission. We have not traditionally funded K through 12.  
15 We've had this discussion many times before and tabled or passed it by, the  
16 proposal in Education. Our charge through the legislation is indemnification  
17 and economic revitalization. I understand education goes with that. I think  
18 we've done a good job with education in all the programs that we've funded.  
19 We've done the nursing program, and in my area the truck driving and  
20 heavy equipment operators, and so forth. I just don't think that's the  
21 direction we need to go in at this time. I think all this information could be  
22 furnished to the Secretary, and certainly they could attend meetings if they  
23 wanted to, but I don't think at this time we should do that.

24 SECRETARY WAGNER: The Secretary of  
25 Education could be part of the committee that considers the educational

1 grants. Is that feasible without having to do a Code change?

2 MR. NOYES: We don't have non-Commission  
3 members as members of the committee.

4 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman, I thought  
5 about this, and I read the By-laws with this in mind, and in my view there's  
6 no prohibition in the By-laws against the Chairman of the Commission  
7 naming a person to a committee who is not a member of the Commission.  
8 They just would have no voting power. They could come and participate but  
9 can't vote. The Blue Ribbon Panel itself was a sub-committee of the  
10 Commission appointed by the Chair, and none of whom were members of  
11 the Commission.

12 MR. NOYES: Not a standing committee.

13 DELEGATE BYRON: It would be at the  
14 discretion of the Chairman of the Commission.

15 SENATOR RUFF: I'd make a motion that the  
16 Secretary of Education be invited to come to any Education Committee  
17 meeting as a non-voting member but would be there to provide input and  
18 answer questions that may come up.

19 SECRETARY WAGNER: Second.

20 DELEGATE BYRON: Would you change that to  
21 include inviting?

22 SENATOR RUFF: Inviting.

23 DELEGATE BYRON: Secretary of Education or  
24 any appropriate representative. Do you want to do that, or eliminate it, or  
25 just the Secretary of Education?

1                   SENATOR RUFF: We have open meetings, and  
2 we'd be delighted to have the Secretary of Education make any appropriate  
3 comments, but I don't want to slap the Blue Ribbon Panel in its face.

4                   DELEGATE WRIGHT: In that case, should we  
5 make a motion on this item? Should Senator Ruff make a follow-up motion  
6 that he wants to make?

7                   DELEGATE BYRON: We can amend it, of  
8 course. Why don't you repeat the motion?

9                   SENATOR RUFF: That the Secretary of  
10 Education would be made aware and invited to meet at any Education  
11 Committee meeting.

12                  SECRETARY WAGNER: Second.

13                  DELEGATE BYRON: Any further discussion?

14                  DELEGATE WRIGHT: We're not voting either  
15 way on making the person a member of the Commission.

16                  SENATOR RUFF: We're not voting on that.

17                  SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: At this time we  
18 could pass it by with an amendment or suggestion that includes the Secretary  
19 of Education would be invited to Education meetings, to pass it by, is that  
20 correct? Are we amending the recommendation?

21                  DELEGATE BYRON: We're adopting the  
22 amended recommendation. Any further discussion on that? All in favor say  
23 aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

24                  MR. STEPHENSON: The Blue Ribbon Panel has  
25 recommended that the Commission Staff meet regularly with the Partnership

1 and with the planning district commissions to plan for regional approaches  
2 for economic revitalization.

3 DELEGATE MARSHALL: It's not happening  
4 now?

5 MR. STEPHENSON: It is.

6 DELEGATE MARSHALL: How often?

7 MR. NOYES: Several times a day. We're already  
8 doing it.

9 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I would like to  
10 really congratulate the Staff of the Tobacco Commission and the Tobacco  
11 Commission as a whole for the cooperation and collaboration with the  
12 VEDP. Certainly every VEDP project has been much cooperation and  
13 collaboration with the Tobacco Commission. I'm a little surprised this  
14 recommendation was made by the Blue Ribbon Panel, because it kind of  
15 indicates that it's not happening. I'd just like to congratulate the Staff in that  
16 area.

17 DELEGATE BYRON: If I might ask, because it  
18 gets confusing when you look through some of these. I know they meet with  
19 Staff, so I assume Staff must have mentioned it and somehow it got lost. As  
20 we look at these recommendations and we come up with, I guess, a new  
21 model for Long-Range Planning, right now we're just doing this discussion  
22 to get through the additional recommendations to include in that Long-  
23 Range Plan. Once we come up with something that we're already doing, do  
24 we want to say continue to meet, or do we just get rid of it? If it's your  
25 concern that we put something in there that we're already doing so it doesn't



1 look like we haven't been doing, but yet do we want to clarify and say  
2 continue to meet, or we're just looking at a recommendation and then decide  
3 what we do with recommendations at a later point? It might be beneficial to  
4 say that it's a good thing and we're doing it, rather than table it. If we say we  
5 tabled that, we should say continue to meet.

6 DELEGATE WRIGHT: Wouldn't that be covered  
7 in the letter that you were discussing with Neal?

8 MR. NOYES: During the Blue Ribbon Panel's  
9 discussion, part of what was going on in relation to this recommendation  
10 was showing Board meetings, we were actually talking about the Board,  
11 VEDP and Board of the Tobacco Commission at some intervals holding  
12 joint meetings. That was providing context to this Committee in terms of it,  
13 not just about Staff. I think the staff at VEDP and certainly our Staff, the  
14 Commission Staff, is very comfortable right now. This was taking it to a  
15 new level and making sure that the Economic Development Partnership and  
16 the Commission are working hand-in-hand, and that was kind of the context.

17 DELEGATE BYRON: And some of these things  
18 that we're already doing, and VEDP coming down in our community, they  
19 can come around and feel the earth and talk to some of the people, too. In  
20 that regard I certainly support putting VEDP in the community. I think it's  
21 good for them to leave Richmond and come to the Southside area and to  
22 walk the streets.

23 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: I would hasten to  
24 add that we have representatives of VEDP who live in Danville. They are  
25 members of the community, have grown up there and live there. Steve

1 Bridges is in Abingdon, and others. That's in addition to all the marketing  
2 that's done actually on a weekly basis for Southside and Southwest you may  
3 not be aware of, because it's done in a confidential manner, but I wouldn't  
4 want anybody reading the Minutes to think there is not vigorous activity in  
5 those regions, as evidenced by the GOF awards in Southside and Southwest.

6 DELEGATE BYRON: I know several years ago  
7 VEDP spent a whole day in our area, and it was very beneficial, and there's  
8 money that was invested, and it's wonderful to have the whole group there  
9 on occasion, maybe quarterly or something, and I think that would be  
10 beneficial to the efforts that are being made from the contacts they get in  
11 Richmond for job creation. Whether or not that meets number 13, I don't  
12 know. In essence 13 was for the Staff or members?

13 MR. STEPHENSON: I'll read to you on page 25  
14 from the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendation. "Collaborating and  
15 conducting joint meetings with VEDP and planning district commissions to  
16 produce multi-year investment plans for regional economic revitalization."

17 DELEGATE BYRON: What about a regional  
18 meeting where VEDP comes down to Danville and whoever else can attend  
19 some kind of meeting like that?

20 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I don't see where it's  
21 necessary to put something like that. It seems to me that's kind of  
22 unnecessary legislation.

23 DELEGATE BYRON: Sometimes if we don't do  
24 that and let them know their recommendations are considered, not give us a  
25 date, but they understand our point of view.

1 SENATOR WAMPLER: Madam Chairman, I  
2 think we already do this in Southwest. I don't know that we need to put  
3 more meat on the bone, words to that effect.

4 DELEGATE BYRON: I think maybe it's a  
5 question of it's good to talk about it. If it's being done, then at a further time  
6 we can always stop.

7 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I think we've made it  
8 abundantly clear that our intent is to consider all recommendations of the  
9 Blue Ribbon Panel, and I don't think that we need to tiptoe around. We've  
10 made it clear that just because we don't accept an exact proposal doesn't  
11 mean that we can't discuss it and consider it at some other time.

12 I'd move that we pass this by.

13 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Second.

14 DELEGATE BYRON: We've had a motion to  
15 pass it by, and seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor say aye?  
16 (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

17 MR. STEPHENSON: Two more remain, Madam  
18 Chairman. Item number three suggested that the Commission commit a burn  
19 rate to Treasury, a spending rate or burn rate of the Endowment so as to  
20 enable Treasury to choose the proper maturity date of the investment.

21 SECRETARY WAGNER: The legislation is  
22 dictated so you would look for the most you can take out. The Staff of the  
23 Tobacco Commission provided Treasury with a spending plan so Treasury  
24 can work with that. I'm not sure that getting a more specific burn rate than  
25 you can currently do would really enhance the data.

1           The question the Commission has to answer is how do we view  
2 the securitization. You'll remember that when we did this back in '05 the  
3 idea was that we were going to securitized the revenue and let it spend  
4 down, the bonds get paid back and you got your revenue from the MSA and  
5 it would be pretty much used up. That's very different from an Endowment  
6 where you put the money away and kind of enjoy the earnings and you don't  
7 view it as a distributive source. I think some of the recommendations take  
8 the view that we should have an Endowment. When I was State Treasurer  
9 we decided and the Commission decided it was something you were going to  
10 use up and invest, and then you'd have the MSA payments. That's really all  
11 a philosophical difference, and there's nothing wrong either way with it. It's  
12 a decision if you move more to an Endowment mode then you do need to  
13 commit a much smaller burn rate and invest for the long term. If the idea is  
14 to do it the first way, then what you're doing makes sense.

15           SENATOR WAMPLER: I would say that while  
16 we think we know what our spending plan may be 36 months down the road,  
17 we really don't. We think we have a pretty good plan in place, whether it's  
18 technology or revitalization and finishing indemnification. There will be  
19 new appointments two years from now, maybe sooner, and I haven't looked  
20 at all the expiring dates, but I think it's up to us to determine as quickly and  
21 as reasonably as we can where our spend rate would be and let Treasury  
22 know and do that accordingly. I think they've done a pretty good job of it so  
23 far, and I think that's all we can do.

24           DELEGATE BYRON: Do we have a motion?  
25 We have a motion to pass it by. Is there a second? A second. Any further

1 discussion? All in favor say aye? (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

2 MR. STEPHENSON: Madam Chairman, the Blue  
3 Ribbon Panel has recommended to you that you use some of the resources to  
4 fund health care delivery throughout the region, which you have not  
5 historically done in the past.

6 DELEGATE WRIGHT: I look at this kind of the  
7 same way I do suggestions and in some cases education. We do things that  
8 we're training people through education to be nurses and so forth and health  
9 care people. That's not part of this thing, of funding health care delivery,  
10 that's not part of our mandate. I don't think we should do it. I think we  
11 should concentrate on economic development through education. We've  
12 done a wonderful job with that, I think.

13 DELEGATE MARSHALL: I would agree that the  
14 best way to accomplish number 22 is to create jobs with health benefits and  
15 other benefits. What's next? Are we going to try to help people who have  
16 not, you know, I think 22 needs to go by the wayside, and I'd make a motion  
17 to pass it by.

18 DELEGATE BYRON: We have a motion to pass  
19 it by, and a second. Any more discussion?

20 MR. NOYES: I'd like to say for the record there  
21 have been a number of opportunities for the Commission to make an  
22 investment that is health care related, and the Commission has done that  
23 through various programs. The Commission is not ignoring health care.

24 DELEGATE BYRON: Any further discussion?  
25 There's a motion to pass it by, and it's seconded. All in favor say aye?

1 (Ayes.) Opposed? (No response.)

2 SECRETARY GOTTSCHALK: Madam

3 Chairman, can I ask a question? At the last meeting I was asking whether  
4 we're going to have another date?

5 MR. NOYES: Education, for example, identifying  
6 those gaps, I think this is a matter that we'll be reporting to the Education  
7 Committee when it meets, and there are gaps that the Committee then can  
8 consider.

9 DELEGATE BYRON: I've seen on this page that  
10 we voted on at the last meeting there were three recommendations to table.

11 MR. NOYES: These matters will be taken up on  
12 the 30th of July.

13 DELEGATE BYRON: Otherwise, I think we'll  
14 have the Staff put this all together for us, and then we'll be able to meet at  
15 the Retreat, I guess, and look at it all.

16 MR. NOYES: We'll be happy to make those  
17 arrangements.

18 DELEGATE BYRON: Then if anyone has  
19 anything burning on their mind and they want to add or bring it back before  
20 the Committee, you'll still have the opportunity to do that. We'll try to get  
21 this together before we go, and review it.

22 DELEGATE MARSHALL: Is the plan that we're  
23 going to meet before the meeting in Southwest Virginia? Will Staff send to  
24 us these notes and everything else before that?

25 MR. NOYES: We'll have the Staff report about

1     that, and the Minutes.

2                     DELEGATE BYRON: The comments, will they  
3     be included in regard to the Blue Ribbon Panel?

4                     MR. NOYES: We can do that.

5                     DELEGATE BYRON: Our next meeting date,  
6     then, unless we meet before that, will be at the Retreat, and we'll try to  
7     accommodate everyone here. If there are any further discussion points you  
8     want to bring up or anything you want to make clear. Any further discussion  
9     points you want to bring up?

10                    DELEGATE MARSHALL: Do you want to  
11     choose a time, or do it on the 30th, the 31st, maybe following the full  
12     meeting?

13                    DELEGATE BYRON: Does the Staff know of  
14     any last-minute meetings before the Retreat? The actual Retreat date is July  
15     30th, and the Executive Committee will meet at 2:00, and the Retreat starts  
16     at 3:00. The 30th is the Executive Committee, and I suspect we might need  
17     to meet around noon or something.

18                    MR. NOYES: We'll meet ahead of the Retreat, but  
19     we'll get all that out to you.

20                    DELEGATE BYRON: If we have a meeting, it  
21     will be at that time. It shouldn't take that long.

22                    All right. Do we have any public comments? Does anyone  
23     want to speak from the audience? All right, lunch will be served, and I'll  
24     entertain a motion to adjourn.

25

1 PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 CERTIFICATE OF THE COURT REPORTER

20

21

22

23

24

25

I, Medford W. Howard, Registered Professional  
Reporter and Notary Public for the State of Virginia at large, do hereby  
certify that I was the court reporter who took down and transcribed the  
proceedings of the **Virginia Tobacco Indemnification and Community  
Revitalization Commission Long Range Planning Committee Meeting**

CRANE-SNEAD & ASSOCIATES, INC.



1   **when held on Tuesday, July 8, 2008 at 11:00 a.m. at the Patrick Henry**  
2   **Building, Conference Room 3, Richmond, Virginia.**

3                               I further certify this is a true and accurate  
4   transcript, to the best of my ability to hear and understand the proceedings.

5                               Given under my hand this 25th day of July, 2008.

6

7

8

9

10

11

---

Medford W. Howard

12

Registered Professional Reporter

13

Notary Public for the State of Virginia at Large

14

15

16

17   My Commission Expires: October 31, 2010.

18   Notary Registration Number: 224566